Subject: (UFP)-(CWAP)
Sender: petersondan /INTERNET (petersondan@hotmail.com)
Attached Date: 04/23/00 11:08
Priority: normal
Sensitivity: normal
Importance: normal

Part 1

FROM: petersondan / INTERNET
                    DDT1=RFC-822; DDV1=petersondan@hotmail.com;

  TO: cleanwater / wo, caet-slc

Part 2

  ARPA MESSAGE HEADER

Part 3

I am Oppose your action or non action on the UFP And CWAP Policies. I would like your honest answers to these Questions.

• Why weren't all land users and property owners notified about this new watershed emphasis? Why were only 4 public meetings scheduled? Why are you pushing this while litigation is pending?

• Where does multiple use fit in? Will existing plans have to be revised? Why isn't a cost-benefit analysis required? What is the cumulative impact of the UFP with the other 110 CWAP actions?

• How will public interest be gauged and used in the decision making process? Why didn't you define "significant public use values"?

• What are the indicators of improvement? What kinds of "special protection" do you propose?

• What is the expected cost and timeframe for implementation?
Dan Peterson

Part 4

This item is of type HTML and cannot be displayed as TEXT

I am Oppose your action or non action on the UFP And CWAP Policies. I would like your honest answers to these Questions. · Why weren't all land users and property owners notified about this new watershed emphasis? Why were only 4 public meetings scheduled? Why are you
pushing this while litigation is pending?
· Where does multiple use fit in? Will existing plans have to be revised?
Why isn't a cost-benefit analysis required? What is the cumulative impact of the UFP with the other 110 CWAP actions?
· How will public interest be gauged and used in the decision making process? Why didn't you define "significant public use values"?
· What are the indicators of improvement? What kinds of "special protection" do you propose?
· What is the expected cost and timeframe for implementation?   Dan Peterson